



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/848,662	05/03/2001	Sandeep K. Singhal	6020.0200	7321
25260	7590	01/25/2005	EXAMINER	
MARCIA L. DOUBET P. O. BOX 422859 KISSIMMEE, FL 34742				CASIANO, ANGEL L
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2182	

DATE MAILED: 01/25/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/848,662	SINGHAL ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Angel L Casiano	2182

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 May 2001.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-33 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-33 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 30 August 2002 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

The present Office action is in response to application filed 03 May 2001.

Claims 1-33 are pending.

Drawings

1. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they include the following reference character(s) not mentioned in the description:

- Figures 1, 5; “50”

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d), or amendment to the specification to add the reference character(s) in the description in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(b) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled “Replacement Sheet” in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Specification

2. Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

3. Applicant is reminded of the proper content of an abstract of the disclosure.

A patent abstract is a concise statement of the technical disclosure of the patent and should include that which is new in the art to which the invention pertains. If the patent is of a basic nature, the entire technical disclosure may be new in the art, and the abstract should be directed to the entire disclosure. If the patent is in the nature of an improvement in an old apparatus, process, product, or composition, the abstract should include the technical disclosure of the improvement. In certain patents, particularly those for compounds and compositions, wherein the process for making and/or the use thereof are not obvious, the abstract should set forth a process for making and/or use thereof. If the new technical disclosure involves modifications or alternatives, the abstract should mention by way of example the preferred modification or alternative.

The abstract should not refer to purported merits or speculative applications of the invention and should not compare the invention with the prior art.

Where applicable, the abstract should include the following:

- (1) if a machine or apparatus, its organization and operation;
- (2) if an article, its method of making;
- (3) if a chemical compound, its identity and use;
- (4) if a mixture, its ingredients;
- (5) if a process, the steps.

Extensive mechanical and design details of apparatus should not be given.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. Claims 1-17, 21-22, 24-25, and 27-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 (e) as being anticipated by Vaid [US 2002/0091843 A1].

Regarding claim 1, Vaid teaches system (see Abstract) for providing a *network adapter* (see Figure 1, “108”) for one or more access points in a local area network environment (see [0027] and [0035]). The reference also includes means for connecting said one or more access points to a *wired* network and means for connecting said one or more access points to a *wireless* network (see [0004], [0023]). In addition, Vaid teaches means for enforcing a *managed network* environment (see [0044]). Vaid also teaches means for communicating with a network control server (see Figure 1).

As for claim 2, Vaid teaches a wireline network interface (see *port*, [0023]).

As for claim 3, Vaid teaches a wireless network interface (see *wireless connection type*, [0023]).

As for claim 4, Vaid teaches the wireless network interface coupled to a wireless access point (see [0023]; Figure 1).

As for claim 5, Vaid teaches a wireless access point as comprising an 802.11 type (see *IEEE 802.11*, [0022]).

As for claim 6, Vaid teaches a wireless access point as comprising a Bluetooth type (see [0022]).

As for claim 7, Vaid teaches communication using a Local Area Network (LAN) port (see [0027]).

As for claims 8 and 9, Vaid teaches enforcing a managing network, environment, including an IP stack (see Abstract). A Mobile IP Foreign Agent is an example of the type of IP protocol stack that could be maintained by the system as disclosed by Vaid.

As for claim 10, Vaid teaches detecting and handling packets corresponding to a plurality of network services (see *service provider*, Abstract).

As for claim 11, Vaid teaches coordination software (see *operation*, [0033]).

As for claim 12, Vaid teaches wireline interfaces (see *wired connection*, [0023]).

As for claim 13, Vaid teaches wireline interfaces (see *wireless connection type*, [0023]).

As for claim 14, Vaid teaches a switch as part of the system (see [0025]).

As for claims 15 and 16, Vaid teaches a switch programmed to forward packets (see *direct data through the network*, [0025]).

As for claim 17, Vaid teaches wireless clients forwarding packets to the network adapter (see [0007]).

As per claim 21, the network adapter disclosed by Vaid includes a special purpose computing machine (see Figure 3).

As per claim 22, Vaid teaches software stored within access points (see [0034]).

As for claim 24, Vaid teaches the network adapter (see Figure 3, “300”) as connectable to access point. In addition, the reference teaches communication in a LAN (see [0035]).

As for claim 25, Vaid teaches ability to connect to other networks (See [0028]).

Regarding claim 27, Vaid teaches the system for providing a network adapter for one or more access points in a LAN environment. Therefore, the cited reference also teaches the *method* for *providing* the network, as presented in claim 27. This claim is rejected under the same basis.

As for claims 28-33, these correspond to the method for providing the system having the network adapter disclosed in previous claims. Vaid teaches the limitations corresponding to the system for providing the network adapter and therefore teaches the limitation for the method claimed. Accordingly, claims 28-33 are rejected under the same basis.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 18-21, 23, and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Vaid [US 2002/0091843 A1].

As for claims 18-21, Vaid does not explicitly recite the *network control server* as being “co-located” with the network adapter, a Core Server or a Routing Coordinator. However, Vaid teaches (see [0022]) different standards for allowing the network control server (see “102”) to communicate. Therefore, it would have been obvious to co-locate the network control server with different devices, depending on the communication standard selected by the user.

As for claim 23, Vaid does not explicitly teach a network control server as being distributed over a wired network, as claimed. Vaid teaches (see [0023]) different standards for allowing the network control server to communicate over a wired network (example, USB). Therefore, it would have been obvious to distribute the network control server, depending on the communication standard selected by the user for wired communication.

As for claim 26, Vaid does not explicitly recite the network adapter as being “co-located” with a Handoff Management Point, Home Address Masquerader or a Foreign Address Masquerader. However, Vaid teaches (see [0022]) different standards for allowing the network adapter (see “102”) to communicate. Therefore, it would have been obvious to co-locate the network adapter with different devices, depending on the communication standard selected by the user.

Conclusion

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

- Eickemeyer [US 6,694,425 B1] teaches a data processing system including a network-adapter connecting a processing unit to a local area network (LAN).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Angel L Casiano whose telephone number is 571-272-4142. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00-5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jeffrey Gaffin can be reached on 571-272-4146. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2182

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Alc
17 January 2005,



KIM HUYNH
PRIMARY EXAMINER
1/19/05